UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/542,349	07/14/2005	Helge Simula	3501-1104	1438
466 YOUNG & TH	7590 02/17/200 OMPSON	EXAMINER		
209 Madison St		BAYAT, ALI		
	Suite 500 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2624	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/17/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/542,349	SIMULA, HELGE			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	ALI BAYAT	2624			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 Ju This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 17-33 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrav 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 17-33 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on 14 July 2005 is/are: a) The drawing(s) filed on 14 July 2005 is/are: a) The drawing(s) filed on 14 July 2005 is/are: a) The drawing(s) filed on 14 July 2005 is/are: a) The drawing(s) filed on 14 July 2005 is/are: a) The drawing(s) filed on 14 July 2005 is/are: a) The drawing(s) filed on 14 July 2005 is/are: a) The drawing(s) filed on 14 July 2005 is/are: a) The drawing(s) filed on 14 July 2005 is/are: a) The drawing(s)	vn from consideration. relection requirement. r.	ov the Evaminer			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the on Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the one o	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). lected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/29/05;7/14/05.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	nte			

Application/Control Number: 10/542,349 Page 2

Art Unit: 2624

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 27-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter as follows. Claim 27 as whole defines a signal, carrier wave, please see claim 32 which depends to claim 27 and Para.0036 of specification for "telecommunications signal"; and "[a] transitory, propagating signal ... is not a "process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter." Those four categories define the explicit scope and reach of subject matter patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 101; thus, such a signal cannot be patentable subject matter." (In re Nuijten, 84 USPQ2d 1495 (Fed. Cir. 2007)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement

thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

The USPTO "Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility" (Official Gazette notice of 22 November 2005), Annex IV, reads as follows (see also MPEP 2106):

Descriptive material can be characterized as either "functional descriptive material" or "nonfunctional descriptive material." In this context, "functional descriptive material" consists of data structures and computer programs which impart functionality when employed as a computer component. (The definition of "data structure" is "a physical or logical relationship among data elements, designed to support specific data manipulation functions." The New IEEE Standard Dictionary of Electrical and Electronics Terms 308 (5th ed. 1993).)

"Nonfunctional descriptive material" includes but is not limited to music, literary works and a compilation or mere arrangement of data.

When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994) (claim to data structure stored on a computer readable medium that increases computer efficiency held statutory) and Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1360-61, 31 USPQ2d at 1759 (claim to computer having a specific data structure stored in memory held statutory product-by-

process claim) with Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760 (claim to a data structure per se held nonstatutory).

In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program is a computer element which defines structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and the rest of the computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory. See Lowry, 32 F.3d at 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d at 1035.

Claims 27-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter as follows. Claim 27 defines a computer program, embodying functional descriptive material (i.e., a computer program or computer executable code). However, the claim does not define a "computer-readable medium or computer-readable memory" and is thus nonstatutory for that reason (i.e., "When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized" -Guidelines Annex IV). The scope of the presently claimed invention encompasses products that are not necessarily computer readable, and thus NOT able to impart any functionality of the recited program. The examiner suggests amending the claim(s) to embody the program on "computer-readable medium" or equivalent; assuming the specification does NOT define the computer readable medium as a "signal", "carrier wave", or "transmission

medium" which are deemed non-statutory (refer to "note" below). Any amendment to the claim should be commensurate with its corresponding disclosure. Note:

"A transitory, propagating signal ... is not a "process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter." Those four categories define the explicit scope and reach of subject matter patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 101; thus, such a signal cannot be patentable subject matter." (In re Nuijten, 84 USPQ2d 1495 (Fed. Cir. 2007). Should the full scope of the claim as properly read in light of the disclosure encompass non-statutory subject matter such as a "signal", the claim as a whole would be non-statutory. Should the applicant's specification define or exemplify the computer readable medium or memory (or whatever language applicant chooses to recite a computer readable medium equivalent) as statutory tangible products such as a hard drive, ROM, RAM, etc, as well as a non-statutory entity such as a "signal", "carrier wave", or "transmission medium", the examiner suggests amending the claim to include the disclosed tangible computer readable storage media, while at the same time excluding the intangible transitory media such as signals, carrier waves, etc.

Merely reciting functional descriptive material as residing on a "tangible" or other medium is not sufficient. If the scope of the claimed medium covers media other than "computer readable" media (e.g., "a tangible media", a "machine-readable media", etc.), the claim remains non-statutory. The full scope of the

claimed media (regardless of what words applicant chooses) should not fall outside that of a computer readable medium.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35
U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this
Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 17, 21-22, 26-27 and 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Okada (US patent 6,643,402).

Regarding claim 17 ,Okada provides for encoding a digital image, wherein, until the encoded image fits into the desired amount of data, the method repeats (col. 7 lines 60-65, see code amount of the compression image becomes equal to or smaller than a predetermined value): encoding the image into an encoded image (col.7 lines 55-60 see Hoffman coding), the encoding comprising quantizing causing lossy compression (col.7 lines 55-60, see quantization); decoding the encoded image into an image col.7 lines 55-60 see Hoffman decoding), the decoding comprising inverse quantizing(col.7 lines 55-60, see quantization); and increasing the losses in compression caused by the quantizing (col. 7 lines 60-65, see code amount of the compression image counted by the code amount counter becomes equal to or smaller than predetermined value).

Application/Control Number: 10/542,349 Page 7

Art Unit: 2624

Regarding claims 21,26 and 31 ,Okada provides for , wherein the desired amount of data is defined as the size of the file used for compression density of the encoded image (col. 7 lines 60-65, see code amount of the compression image counted by the code amount counter becomes equal to or smaller than predetermined value).

Regarding claims 22 and 33, see the rejection of claim 1. They recite similar limitations as claim 1. Except for a feedback connection (Fig.3 element Huffman table 135 and Quantization table 134). Hence they are similarly analyzed and rejected.

Regarding claim 27, see the rejection of claim 1. It recited similar limitations except for a computer program (col.19 lines 20-25 see software). Hence it is similarly analyzed and rejected.

Regarding claim 32, Okada provide for, wherein the carrier comprises at least one of the following: computer memory, computer-readable memory (Fig.3 see flash memory or frame buffer 105).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

⁽a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 18-20, 23-25 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okada (US 6,643,402) in view of Maeda (US 5,861,962).

Regarding claims 18,23 and 28, Okada provides for optimizing the quality of the encoded image, the losses in compression caused by quantizing are increased in such a manner that each encoding reduces the amount of data required by the encoded image by 1/4 to 1/100 of the amount of data required originally (col.7 lines 55-65). Okada does not provide for the compression of data to a specific amount (1/4 -1/100). Maeda provides for the compression of data to a specific amount (col.15 lines 35-40 see data are compressed to ¼ through quantizing value; also see col.19 lines 60-65, see scaled data are reduced to 1/n, for example, ½ by the error diffusion processing section, further examiner interpret that reduction of data to 1/n corresponds to reduction of data to 1/100, because n is an integer value, and it can be any number. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Maeda with the system and method of Okada to minimizing an increase in capacity of a storage section in response to an increase in image data volume as a result of enlarged-scaling processing to save the costs of the resulting apparatus. See col.1 lines 55-60of Maeda.

Regarding claims 19-20, 24-25, 29 and 30 see the rejection of claim 18. They recite similar limitations as claim 18. Hence they are similarly analyzed and rejected.

Contact Information

Page 9

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ALI BAYAT whose telephone number is (571)272-7444. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00 AM-5:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Bella can be reached on 571-272-7778. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Matthew C Bella/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2624

Ali Bayat Patent Examiner Division 2624 Application/Control Number: 10/542,349

Art Unit: 2624

2/12/09

Page 10